

NOW ON TUESDAY NIGHTS!

8:30 EST

7:30 CST

8:30 MST

8:30 PST

NOVEMBER 4, 1947

Illinois Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



U.S. Pat. Off.

How Should We Meet the Threat of the New Comintern?

Moderator, **GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.**

Speakers

GLEN H. TAYLOR

DOROTHY THOMPSON

Interrogators

ARTHUR GAETH

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

COMING

—November 11, 1947—

What Should We Do To Check Rising Prices?

—November 18, 1947—

What Future for Germany?

Published by **THE TOWN HALL, Inc.**, New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 13, NUMBER 28



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 4:

"How Should We Meet the Threat of the New Comintern?"

<i>Mr.</i> DENNY	3
<i>Senator</i> TAYLOR	4
<i>Miss</i> THOMPSON	7
<i>Mr.</i> GAETH	10
<i>Major</i> ELIOT	13
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	16
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 11:

"What Should We Do To Check Rising Prices?"

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 18:

"What Future for Germany?"

The Broadcast of November 4, 1947, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



NOVEMBER 4, 1947

VOL. 13, No. 28

How Should We Meet the Threat of the New Comintern?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Again the subject of Russian-American relations is before us—a subject difficult to avoid if we're to stay on top of the news. After all, these two nations are out in front in the world struggle for power, and if we're to judge by what goes on from day to day in the United Nations and the independent actions of both governments, many of their conflicts are irreconcilable.

Does this mean a shooting war? Not necessarily. But it does mean ideological, economic, and political warfare.

Early last month the Communist Parties of Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, France, and Italy announced the organization of a new Communist International with the avowed purpose of combating the alleged imperial-

ism of the United States, and particularly the Marshall Plan.

Now the Marshall Plan, as all well-informed Town Meeting listeners know, is not really a plan at all, but merely a suggestion by Secretary Marshall that the European nations get together and determine what they can do for themselves and let us know how much help they felt they needed from the outside.

The Russians began immediately to read motives into this suggestion, and declined to participate in the conference called by the French and British governments to draw up a statement of Europe's needs and resources. Indeed, they did their best to prevent their satellite nations from participating.

Is the announcement of the Comintern Russia's answer to the Marshall Plan? One of our speakers, Miss Dorothy Thompson, thinks it is. On the other hand,

Senator Glen Taylor of Idaho, believes that America's present foreign policy is largely at fault. We're in for an interesting debate, but if we're to profit by this debate, we must weigh the arguments pro and con with the utmost care. We cannot afford the luxury of a careless or prejudiced decision.

Our interrogators, Major George Fielding Eliot, syndicated columnist of the *New York Post*, and Mr. Arthur Gaeth, radio commentator and foreign correspondent, and this representative Town Hall audience will have some searching questions for both of these speakers.

So let's hear first from the distinguished United States Senator, who is interrupting his ride across the country in protest against our foreign policy, to fly here for this meeting, the Honorable Glen H. Taylor of Idaho. Senator Taylor. (*Applause.*)

Senator Taylor:

I thank you. I am convinced that if we had been following a policy of "do unto others as you would have others do unto you," we would not now be discussing "How Should We Meet the Threat of the New Comintern?" for our best defense against any threat from abroad is the sympathy of the freedom-loving peoples of the world. They should be our natural allies. But our foreign policy of the last few years has not only made Russia distrust us; it has

gained us the ill-will of nearly every country on the earth.

First, we scuttled UNRRA, then we tried to tell the folks that relief would be given only if the governments adopt policies that please us, and now when a hungry Europe looks to us for assistance Congress seems to be getting ready to make more enemies.

How have the leaders of Congress responded to Secretary Marshall's call for aid? The chairman of the most important committee in Congress, whose vision will go down in history, returned from Europe saying that he had observed no hunger.

It is now apparent that Congress will vote for foreign aid only if we can tell Europeans what sort of politics they should have.

Harold Stassen, a liberal Republican, wants us to make it a condition of our aid to Britain that further socialization of industry must cease. Imagine how that sort of effrontery will sit with the people of England.

Senator Wiley wants us to be sure that aid to Europe will be used to the advantage of American capital over there. In France and Italy, we make no attempt to conceal the fact that U. S. wheat is to be baked only into a conservative loaf.

Can any amount of money buy us friendship when it is dispersed in so arrogant and so humiliating a fashion?

Communism's best recruiting agents are the military strategists and Wall Streeters who are guiding our foreign policy. They offer a starving man a piece of bread and say, "You can have a little bite of this if you promise not to be a Communist." Any man who suffers that kind of an indignity might well turn to communism just to show his independence.

We have poured money and arms into Greece and Turkey, and have backed reactionary regimes merely because they promised to fight communism. We, who profess to hold our Constitution so dear, have made ourselves the laughingstock of Europe with our Congressional witch hunts and kleig-lighted inquisitions into people's private beliefs. Will this convince neutral Europeans that we are the land of freedom, or will we endear ourselves to the darker races who comprise most of the earth's population by continuing the racial discrimination which was so well described last week in the report made to the President by his Commission on Civil Rights?

No, the best friends of the Communist International are those who profess to be its greatest enemies. The Americans who do most to block the spread of communism are those of us who strive to protect civil liberty and ensure a decent standard of living for all our people at home, and who want

to offer nondictatorial assistance abroad through the instrumentalities of the United Nations.

I believe we can get along with Russia. Our relations were improving under the guidance of Roosevelt. During the war the Comintern was dissolved as a gesture of goodwill toward the American people or, perhaps it was a demonstration of confidence in the friendly intentions of Roosevelt. I don't know which. But of one thing I am convinced. If we still had Franklin D. Roosevelt with us we would not now be faced with a frightful prospect of World War III. (*Applause.*)

No one can win such a war. To begin with, we would be forced to set up a military dictatorship to prosecute the war, and thereby lose everything we should profess to be fighting for.

I do not see how we could successfully invade Russia, or how they could invade America. We could conceivably just go on dropping atom bombs and rockets filled with new and horrible diseases on each other until humanity ceased to exist, or return to the caves from whence our ancestors came.

Last week Rear Admiral Zacharias made news with a statement that mankind now has the weapons—cheap weapons available to all—that could eradicate all plant, animal, and human life from this planet and render our globe uninhabitable for one thousand years.

Some of our more affluent citizens have such a pathological hatred and fear of Russia that they are willing to risk the extinction of mankind in a desperate effort to erase communism from the earth.

Why don't they stop to consider that after the wreckage of the first World War one-sixth of the earth went communist, World War II caused six more nations to go communist. What do they expect to happen after World War III?

How have we reached this unhappy impasse with Russia? Whose idea is this "get tough" foreign policy?

Personally, I fail to see what anyone could gain from such a conflict. And you might well ask who could gain by it. Who would be so foolish as to advocate it and why?

Well, there are some. Former Governor Earle of Pennsylvania, for example, has been urging that we drop atom bombs on Russia before they get one. Of course, we all know that Russia is devastated and hardly in a position to attack anybody. But I hope we don't repeat Hitler's sad mistake of assuming that the Russians would be unable to resist aggression.

To better understand the reasons for all this war talk, just put yourself in the place of the admirals and generals. They did a great job of directing our war

effort, honors were heaped upon them, they were given untold billions to spend and, of necessity, they spent most of it with the big corporations.

Then suddenly the war ended. Already an organization to keep peace in the world had been set up—the United Nations. If peace were firmly established and disarmament came about, the Generals would be out of a job. They were prepared for no other vocation or occupation. Perhaps they would have to start at the bottom of the ladder in some other field of endeavor. Gone would be the honors, the brass, the braid, the prestige.

How would you feel under those circumstances?

Well, the generals didn't relish the prospect either. They wanted to remain generals, but in order to retain their rank and all that went with it, they must have a big army. In order to get the necessary appropriations from Congress, the American taxpayers would have to be convinced that they were in danger of attack. There had to be a bogeyman to scare us into coughing up the money.

There was only one candidate for this dubious honor—Russia. Our press and professional Communist-haters had spent 25 years vilifying Russia between World Wars. It was a simple matter to take up where they left off.

The generals began warning us of our peril. The controlled press headlined their words. Our militaristic, Wall Street foreign policy is completely bankrupt. It has failed to make friends of Russia, and by its arrogant manner it has lost us the friendship of almost every country on earth.

In case of war with Russia, we would be practically without allies. To keep peace in the world, we must have a new foreign policy—a policy based on the Golden Rule. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Taylor. Now let's hear a voice familiar to Town Meeting listeners. She's a syndicated columnist, author and lecturer, who will open Town Hall's 54th lecture season tomorrow morning at eleven, Miss Dorothy Thompson. Miss Thompson. (*Applause.*)

Miss Thompson:

Senator Taylor, friends. I, too, have been a critic of our foreign policy. I have tried, however, to give reasons for my doubts and certainly I've not drawn any views of American foreign policy from the anti-American tirades of *Pravda*, or the speeches of Mr. Vishinsky, according to which all the world is full of peaceable lands except for the big, bad wolf of the United States.

My criticism of our foreign policy has been rather different

from Senator Taylor's. We started the war with the policy of the Atlantic Charter—to restore the lost liberties of countries, renounce all expansion, and reconstruct the world in a system of workable, collective security, equally protecting the rights of all nations, great or small.

But after Russia came into the war, we rejected these principles and envisaged a postwar world based upon a permanent great power alliance, in which the great powers in consultation with each other, would settle the fate of mankind with the small states compelled to toe the line.

This resumption of ruthless power politics could only have one possible outcome—a predictable outcome—disagreement between the self-appointed masters of the globe, the moment one of them went too far in external expansion, and this is exactly what's happened.

The initial stages of that policy were a series of Munichs in which Great Britain and the United States bartered away other peoples' nations, rights, lives, and property to appease the seemingly insatiable appetite of the Russians for the sake of a great power peace. It is to this stage that the Russians and their champions here apparently wish us to return.

But now, after this policy has resulted in the partition and wrecking of Europe, we are be-

ginning to come to our senses and to use our power to rebuild instead of to wreck—still too little, but we may hope not too late.

The question posed this evening is how to answer the threat of the Cominform. Well, there are ways not to answer it. The Hollywood performance in Washington is certainly one way *not* to answer it. (*Applause.*)

If you wish to aid Communists, just help them confuse their aims and enable them to stand as hypocritical defenders of civil rights with the support of sincere anti-Communists.

A way not to answer was the Truman Doctrine, with its provocative "anti" spirit, loudly and incautiously directed against the Soviet Union.

The way, however, to answer lies in the direction of the Marshall proposals. These have alarmed the Communists precisely because they are not provocative, are wholly constructive, were offered to all countries regardless of their forms of government, and would have been accepted even by Poland and Czechoslovakia if the Soviets had not slapped them down.

The Marshall proposals say that, within the limits of our power as a source, we are prepared to help all European states who will mutually plan the best use of their own resources. Simply because these proposals are reasonable and

generous, they have driven the Communists crazy.

First, the Soviets upset their own satellites by telling them they must refuse an attractive offer.

Then they launched a campaign to prove that this was American imperialism, which amounts to advising starving people to bite the hand that feeds them.

Finally, they have committed the disastrous error of reviving the never-defunct Comintern right out in the open.

Now, the result of this may be lamentable because it's driving countries violently to the Right. I anticipate that one of these days American diplomatic influence will be trying to restrain European anti-Communists from going too far, as they have incidentally worked to restrain them in Greece.

In fact, the Marshall plan has shaken the confidence of the Soviet and the Communists, and the response has been to fall back upon every reactionary tactic of the '20's and '30's.

Again the Communists have set out to divide the workers by making social democrats Enemy No. 1. Again they are giving aid and comfort to the parties of the extreme Right, just as in the '20's the excesses which they induced the Italian labor movement helped create Mussolini; just as in Germany, in the '30's, their disintegrating labor tactics and their assaults upon the German Republic

greatly aided Hitler. So now they're starting the whole wretched pattern over again.

I must say that if the definition of a Bourbon, is someone who forgets nothing and learns nothing, the Kremlin and the International Communist Party rightly deserve the name of Bourbon. (*Applause.*)

For over two years, this great country has been watching Russia and the Communists with the paralyzed fascination of a rabbit for a snake. Now, we begin to think and act with our own horse sense.

The Marshall Plan, for instance, stands on its own feet, and would stand on them were there no such thing as communism. In any case, the United States would have to help reconstruct the world's shattered economies. It is dangerous and wholly abnormal for one country alone to be prosperous and solvent. A bankrupt world would eventually bankrupt the United States too.

But there are better minds in our State Department today — they are in the heads of civilians or former military men — than have been there in a long time. If Congress fully backs the Marshall ideas and proposals, and ways are found to implement them, and if the American people stop being only against them and start vigorously to implement peace, reconstruction, law, and mercy, the

Communists are likely to perish of apoplexy as I feared Mr. Vishinsky would once or twice.

Communists can only successfully operate in a political, economic, and spiritual vacuum. Democracy must set its own goals to fill that vacuum. I propose three:

1. End the terror of starvation. Work with all men and nations of good will for the integration of scientific and material resources on a world basis for the welfare of all people.

2. End terror within nations. Support everywhere constitutionally founded, legally protected rights of men.

3. End the terror of war. Act with courage to transform the United Nations into an association of states, living under specific enforceable laws designed to prevent aggression and preparation for aggression, and to limit all armaments and abolish those of mass destruction, under foolproof, cheat-proof international inspection and control.

Use American power, not for the triumph of the American century, but for the victory of world law. Fill the vacuum of destruction and despair and hatred with economic hope and democratic faith, and the Communists, while they will certainly remain a public nuisance, will cease to be a public menace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Dorothy Thompson. Now it's time to hear from our special interrogators, Major George Fielding Eliot and Mr. Arthur Gaeth, both of whom are familiar hands on Town Meeting. First, Mr. Arthur Gaeth, who many of you will remember as the man who broadcast the Nuremberg trials and the execution of the Nazi war criminals. Mr. Gaeth. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Gaeth: Miss Thompson, I was glad to hear you say that the Truman Doctrine was not the way to answer the challenge of the Comintern, that it continued the "anti" spirit from which the world is still suffering. You say the Marshall Plan is the way. When did the Marshall Plan disassociate itself from the Truman Doctrine? Where did the Administration ever renounce the Truman Doctrine?

Miss Thompson: Well, you know, Mr. Gaeth, I don't ask so much of the human race. I don't expect governments ever to renounce their own actions, but I just noticed that it did make a change, expressed in a very different way, and I'm willing to go on from there.

Mr. Gaeth: But you speak as if—

Miss Thompson: You don't expect any of these people are going to come out and say, "I was a

wicked, bad man." But the change, they act differently.

Mr. Gaeth: They are still operating on the Truman Doctrine though, in Greece and Turkey.

Miss Thompson: Well, I don't know what they're doing in Greece and Turkey. They have been trying to help the Government end anarchy, in Greece at least. They're trying to help Turkey protect herself from a possible assault. Do you think it's entirely unlikely that Turkey might have an assault?

Mr. Gaeth: Not unlikely.

Miss Thompson: Well, all right, hasn't she the same right to protect herself as the Soviet Union has to protect herself? For heaven's sake! (*Applause.*)

Mr. Gaeth: That still doesn't change the character of the Marshall Plan from that of the Truman Doctrine.

Miss Thompson: I think the Marshall Plan is very different from the Truman Doctrine, because the Marshall Plan is an attempt. First of all it is almost exclusively an economic plan—it's an attempt to bring about a rational reconstruction of the economies of Europe.

Mr. Gaeth: Well, you speak as if we knew what the Marshall Plan was and that it will be promoted in a positive spirit of helpfulness. That isn't the impression I get around Washington. The argument is the same which

developed for the Truman Doctrine, when it had to be sold.

You forget that such men as Senators Brooks, or Malone, or Dworshak, or O'Daniel, or Congressmen Taber, or Knutson, or any number of others actually will have to decide that plan. It has taken a good deal of urging to get a special session. The Administration is willing to lend itself to the whipping up of anti-Russian sentiment in order to get the broadest possible support.

The manner in which the so-called Marshall Plan was promoted via Britain and France, and only second-handedly via Russia, sets the tempo.

In his book, *Speaking Frankly*, Jimmy Byrnes, admits that Molotov's refusals saved Mr. Marshall's bacon. He speculates that Congress might ask for wide inspective powers if a loan is granted which the Russians would have turned down and we would have been seriously embarrassed. I don't see how you can claim that there is such a widespread difference between the spirit of these two. (*Applause.*)

Miss Thompson: Were you asking a question, Mr. Gaeth?

Mr. Gaeth: There is a question attached to the end of it.

Miss Thompson: Then, what you're saying is that there are some interpreters of the Marshall Plan and other interpreters of the Marshall Plan. Now the reason

I am on this platform and, I suppose, the reason you are on this platform is to try, if possible, to bring about a really constructive interpretation of it.

First of all the people in Washington are very much afraid of the people in the United States (*laughter*) and are greatly influenced by the general feeling in the United States.

Mr. Gaeth: Who's leading the Nation?

Miss Thompson: I'm not quite sure, are you?

Mr. Denny: That's another Town Meeting debate — Should Congress Lead or Follow Public Opinion? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Gaeth: Well, why should there be a Marshall Plan suggested privately by the United States and not a program of reconstruction under the direction of the only uniting agency we have in the world—the United Nations?

Miss Thompson: United agency, my eye!

Mr. Gaeth: Well, if it isn't a uniting agency, then we have contributed as much as the rest in not making it such.

Miss Thompson: No, Mr. Gaeth, it can't be, and that's what my speech was about. If you're going to try and base the peace of the world on an alliance between five great powers—effectively only two—with none of the little nations having any more to say than anybody in this audience has to say

about the Soviet Union, then you're not going to have peace and reconstruction. Now, that's broken down, now we have to begin again and try to find a way to really get sanity and morality in the world.

Mr. Gaeth: In other words, you're renouncing the United Nations?

Miss Thompson: Renouncing? I'm not renouncing the United Nations. I'm for a very much stronger and more intelligently organized United Nations than we've got. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Gaeth: Well, how are we going to get it? By the Marshall Plan which is a disuniting factor and not a uniting one?

Miss Thompson: The only way you can get it is to try to convince the people of the world that a better, stronger United Nations is needed and that we've got to have law in the world which the United Nations is quite incapable to make. It hasn't even got the instruments for making it.

Mr. Gaeth: Well, why hasn't it got the instruments? Isn't the United States one of the strong powers that pays a contributing factor in making those instruments? (*Applause.*)

Miss Thompson: Yes, I have criticized the foreign policy of the United States and the Soviet Union—both of them. And I certainly don't think the Soviet Union is

any nobler than we are—far from it, at least in this country.

Mr. Gaeth: I agree with you. I am not here to defend the position of the Soviet Union, but I'm here to talk about a constructive American foreign policy.

Miss Thompson: Now what is it about the Marshall Plan that you are opposed to? May I ask you a question? Do you wish to stop giving aid to Europe?

Mr. Gaeth: The Marshall Plan is a program which is set up on the basis of power politics—the type of thing that you are against.

Miss Thompson: There isn't anything else in the world *but* power politics. I'm in favor of changing power politics, but while we're living in power politics—which is the *only* international life we have—I'm in favor of us behaving decently with our power, and I think the Marshall Plan is a way to behave decently with our power.

Mr. Gaeth: That hasn't been demonstrated yet, because the same people who made the Truman Doctrine are going to make the Marshall Plan, and you agree with me that the Truman Doctrine was not a sound one.

Miss Thompson: I agree that the Truman Doctrine was very much promoted. Mr. Truman should have had a much better public relations agent than he did. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Gaeth: Then you will admit that the objectives were honorable?

Miss Thompson: Honorable? Dishonorable? I think the Soviet Union will either stop absorbing all of Europe or there is going to be another war. Now, I don't want another war. There is no hate in this. I believe if nations go on expanding and expanding into the Mediterranean, into Western Europe, into China, all over the place, sooner or later there will be a war. It always has happened that way.

Mr. Gaeth: Certainly, by following the program of power politics. But we came to the conclusion that power politics was bad, and we attempted to create an international organization to get around just that type of thing. Unless we support it we're in serious trouble.

Miss Thompson: Excuse me, you didn't come to the conclusion at all. Senator Taylor didn't say one word about a stronger and better United Nations. I said so, and I'm very glad you agree with me. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: I had hopes for a minute there that they were going to settle something.

Now it's time to hear from George Fielding Eliot, another familiar Town Meeting voice, a syndicated columnist and author in his own right. Major Eliot, will you step up and see what you and

Senator Taylor can do? (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: Well, after I read the Senator's speech, I was afraid that some of you folks might be a little alarmed by what he said about what Congress is going to do. Of course, Senator Taylor is a member of that distinguished body.

He said that Congress was going to do some things that would not be very good. He said that relief would be given only if governments accept policies that please us. Congress is getting ready to make more enemies, he says, and it is now apparent that Congress will vote for foreign aid only if we can tell Europeans what sort of politics they should have. He has used in support of this a statement by Harold Stassen who is not a member of Congress and a statement by Senator Wiley.

I thought it might be helpful to try to get facts a little closer to the source of policies on this matter. So this afternoon I spoke on the telephone with Representative Herter of Massachusetts—Christian A. Herter—who happens to be the chairman of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid of the House of Representative. Representative Herter has just returned from Europe where he and his whole committee have been for the past two months. They've been traveling about in the area in which the Marshall Plan is in-

tended to operate. They have talked to the leaders of governments and they have talked to representatives of all shades of political opinion in those countries.

I think what Congressman Herter has to say might come a little closer to what Congress is going to do because after all he and his committee were sent there by the House of Representatives—which has to appropriate the money—in order to get some guidance on the subject.

Congressman Herter's report and the report of his committee hasn't been published yet. It will be published in a day or two. It's a confidential document as yet, but Congressman Herter authorized me to say, emphasizing that he's speaking only for himself at this time, that he feels very strongly indeed that no strings of the sort the Senator speaks of should be attached to our aid to Europe and that any attempt to interfere in the political or economic affairs of European nations would be disastrous.

You may be able to judge from this frank statement how much real worth there is in Senator Taylor's contention that Congress is going to try to dictate to Europeans what kind of government they have. He has quoted two or three foolish statements. I have quoted a direct personal statement from the chairman of the commit-

tee appointed by the House of Representatives to examine and report on European conditions for the guidance of the House. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Taylor, your comment please.

Senator Taylor: Well, of course I don't have secret sources of information available to the Majority. After all—

Major Eliot: Senator, that's frank and open authorized statement by the chairman of a powerful committee of the House.

Senator Taylor: You said it was secret and wasn't available to anybody but you.

Major Eliot: I did not. I said that the statement—

Senator Taylor: After all the Majority is a commentator. I'm only a Senator. (*Laughter.*)

Major Eliot: I said the report of the committee was a secret. Senator. I didn't say his statement was secret.

Senator Taylor: I wouldn't know these things before they are made public, but I'm only going by what we have done in the past and some of the statements of those who are going to vote on these questions. After all, simply because a man heads a foreign affairs committee, doesn't mean that Congress is going to vote the way he might want them to. They'll all vote as they please and very often they vote and don't please me. I can say that sin-

cerely. (*Laughter.*) But we have put strings on all of our aid. We have told people what kind of government they 'should have.

Major Eliot: When did we do that, Senator?

Senator Taylor: Well, in Greece, for instance, we went in there and they would have had a democratic government if we would have left them alone. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Just a second. Miss Thompson wants to comment. Miss Thompson. Yes?

Miss Thompson: I want to ask what strings we put in Greece. Greece had a government that was elected by the people. (*Shouts.*) Excuse me, ladies and gentlemen, Greece had a government which was held under an election with observers of the United Nations present to which the Soviet Union was asked to send an observer and the Soviet Union refused. Now that's a fact.

Senator Taylor: That ain't the way I heard it. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Miss Thompson: Exactly, Senator, what did you hear — about the Soviet Government sending an observer?

Senator Taylor: I didn't hear anything about the Soviet Government sending an observer.

Miss Thompson: It didn't send any, so you couldn't hear about it. But they were invited to.

Senator Taylor: Then why ask me what I heard. (*Laughter.*)

Major Eliot: But you said that wasn't the way you heard it. What did you hear?

Senator Taylor: I heard from many people who were over in Greece and they said the election was not free and the observers—most of them—had bayonets—British bayonets. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Gaeth?

Mr. Gaeth: I was in Europe during that time. Twenty-two out of the 27 observers who were present in Greece during the two or three months before the elections were held made statements contradicting the fact that there was no pressure to make these elections go the way the people in power wanted them to go. If that election was free in Greece, so was every other election in the Balkans and we have done plenty of criticizing about the elections held in the Balkans in recent years. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: Nevertheless there were some 600 American, British, and French observers present in Greece when the elections were held and the reports of these observers were virtually unanimous that the elections were *reasonably* free elections.

Mr. Gaeth: If for three or four months in advance you have driven the people in opposition underground, you can get relatively free elections for those who remain and who have already kissed the administration.

Major Eliot: In other words, the majority of the people of Greece, which you claim support the so-called democratic government in the hills, were driven underground by the minority. The majority are underground.

Mr. Gaeth: No, there were a great many of those people who didn't vote because some of the parties advised their own people not to participate in the elections. There is just the barest kind of a majority which was gotten by the monarchists.

Miss Thompson: But I wanted to ask the question, exactly what strings have we attached to the government in Greece. What we actually have done has been to advise them very strongly to throw out one very, very strong reactionary and take a liberal in. That's the string we've attached. Now maybe we shouldn't have done it but that's what we did.

Mr. Gaeth: Well, Mr. Tsaldaris is still there. We've put a nice old gentleman in as a front, but the King is still on the throne, and

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

GLEN H. TAYLOR—Born in Portland, Oregon, in 1904, Glen Taylor is now a Democratic Senator from Idaho. Educated in the public schools, he became a sheet metal worker's apprentice in 1919, but in 1921, he joined a dramatic stock company of which he became a partner. Since 1926, he has been in the entertainment field as owner and business manager of various enterprises. During the war Senator Taylor went back to his trade in sheet metal as a mechanic in an ordnance plant in San Francisco.

Senator Taylor began studying economics and government because of the hardships he endured and the suffering of others that he witnessed in his travels during the depression. He ran for Congress in 1938 and was fourth in a field of nine in the primaries. He ran for the Senate in 1940 and was nominated but defeated in the election. He ran again in 1942, and was elected in 1944. He is a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

DOROTHY THOMPSON—Miss Thompson is one of the most widely read commentators on world affairs. Her writings, syndicated to more than a hundred newspapers, reach a large audience. She began her journalistic career in London for *International News*, and her subsequent work for the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* in Vienna and Berlin during the rise of the Nazis put her among the principal foreign correspondents. Miss Thompson met Hitler in 1931 when she interviewed

him for a leading magazine. Following her graduation from Syracuse University, Miss Thompson spent several years doing social work. She is author of *Let the Record Speak*, *The New Russia*, and *I Saw Hitler*.

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT—One of the best known among military analysts either on the air or in the press is George Fielding Eliot. Major Eliot was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1894. After his graduation from Melbourne University in Australia, he served with the Australian Imperial Force from 1914 to 1918. From 1922 until 1930 he served as a captain and later as a major in the Military Intelligence Reserve of the United States Army. After five years as an accountant in Kansas City, Missouri, Major Eliot began writing for fiction magazines in 1926. Since 1928 he has written especially on military and international affairs and on military defense. At present he is a syndicated columnist for the *New York Post*.

Major Eliot's books include *If War Comes*, *The Rampants We Watch*, *Bombs Bursting in Air*, and *Hour of Triumph*.

MR. GAETH—Mr. Gaeth, a radio commentator and foreign correspondent, spent 12 of the last 20 years in Europe. Two years of that period (1945-46) were spent in Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. He was formerly an instructor at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

I'm not at all convinced that that is a liberal government. It certainly is corrupt. We found most of the materials we've sent to Greece in warehouses where this government has stolen them and put them away. So if that's an honest government I don't know. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, gentlemen. Now while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in this message.

Announcer: Friends, you are listening to America's most popular radio forum, America's Town

Meeting of the Air. We are discussing the question, "How Should We Meet the Threat of the New Comintern?" This is one night you won't want to miss the printed copy of the entire broadcast, including the questions and answers to follow.

You may secure the Town Meeting Bulletin by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, to cover cost of printing and mailing. You may secure 11 issues for \$1.00, or 26 issues for \$2.35.

Now, for the question period, here is Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: We're still trying to encourage our audience here tonight to ask good questions limited to 25 words. Thus, Town Hall and the publishers of the *Americana Encyclopedia* offer a \$210-set of the *Americana* to the person, who, in the opinion of our committee of judges asks the question they consider best for bringing out facts and broadening the scope of this discussion. However, the committee reserves the right to make no award if no question is considered worthy and the question must not go above 25 words.

Last week, Sergeant A. Ashwood, sitting here on this platform, of 641 Washington St., New York, won the prize.

Now we start with the gentleman back there in the middle and I hope he'll limit it to 25 words.

Man: A question to Dorothy Thompson in 24 words. (*Laughter.*) Can the Marshall Plan stop the Comintern if Congress supports unpopular status quo conservative elements in Europe, forcing the people who want change toward communism?

Miss Thompson: Can the Marshall Plan, the question is, be used—is that the question—to stop the people who want communism? Now the assumption of that question is that the people of Europe want communism. I've been in Europe several times since the war

and I see no reason to believe that that assumption is correct.

The Marshall Plan, assuming that communism is the result of chaos, starvation and despair, and that we wish to remove chaos, starvation and despair, it may stop communism, or halt communism. I, however, think that if political liberties are maintained in Europe and the people don't absolutely starve, Europe will never go communist by a majority vote, and I'm willing to bet. (*Applause.*)

I'd like to say this, the people of Europe are sick and tired of reigns of terror, and what they're promised by communism is another reign of terror. Well, they have had an awful lot.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Now the gentleman here on the second row.

Man: My question is raised to Major Eliot. I'm an ardent newspaper reader for years and years and if I'm going to take the sum total of the knowledge which I have accumulated, I really have come to the conclusion, in respect to the Grecian problem, that the predominant note about Greece is not in the manner that it was given to me tonight. I really am still under the impression that Greece was sold out.

Mr. Denny: I'm sorry, that's a very interesting observation, but the audience at this point is only invited to ask questions, please—25 words.

Man: My question is this. What is in reality the actual situation in Greece? Was Greece sold out or is Greece still in the fold of the democratic countries?

Mr. Denny: All right. Major Eliot, what is the situation in Greece?

Major Eliot: The situation in Greece is that the American government is endeavoring in Greece to restore order. Order is being disturbed in Greece by groups of guerrillas, so-called, which are being supported by assistance from across the line from Albania, Jugoslavia, and Bulgaria, which countries are, of course, under the control of the Soviet Union.

It is our hope that we can restore order in Greece as a basis as a kind of soil in which free institutions, as General Marshall puts it, can emerge and flourish.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Major Eliot. Mr. Gaeth has a five-word question.

Mr. Gaeth: Major Eliot, where were you in Greece last? (*Laughter.*)

Major Eliot: I haven't been in Greece since 1939, Mr. Gaeth. (*Laughter.*) I judged what is going on in Greece by talking to people who have been there, very much as any other reporter has to do. We have our beats and we can get around, and sometimes you can get to Paris and sometimes you can get to London, as Mr. Gaeth perfectly well knows. He

knows that's a trick question and one of those things, being a reporter himself. (*Applause.*)

Lady: This is a question for Senator Taylor. A question in 24 words. How can we make sure that the money we give Europe for food and shelter will not be used against us by our enemies?

Senator Taylor: I don't know how we can, or how we can be sure it will be used for good purposes at all. As I say, we read in the paper the other day that the warehouses of Greece were found to be bursting with all sorts of materiel that we had sent over there. The government, presumably—the way I got it from the press—had put it away, so that they could sell it and make a profit on it later on.

I don't know how we're going to be sure what it's used for. Instead of trying to tell people what it is to be used for, I think if we're going to give, we might just as well give it to them and let them use it as they please, because when you try to tell people how to run their business, or a nation how to run its affairs, you make an enemy. We've lost friends all over the world with the gifts we've given away, that should have made friends for us, simply because we've tried to run other people's business. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Would you like to comment, Miss Thompson, on that question?

Miss Thompson: Well, to answer that question properly, it would take far too long. I would like to say that I don't agree that we can't tell how it is used and that we can't keep some control on what it is used for. We've got to be sure that it is not used for political purposes, that it is not used to reward politicians of any kind, but is used for genuine reproduction of productive capital in Europe. Now that can be done. That is not an impossible thing to do, and it can be done by agreement with the states concerned, so that it does not include any interference with their sovereignty.

I disapproved thoroughly of the thousands of things that were done with UNRRA. I did not regret seeing it dissolved. I was in Europe when it was being administered, and I think few things have been worse administered. It was used for all sorts of political purposes. It was run by, it seems to me, thousands of social workers drawing large salaries, who didn't know much about moving goods. I really regret that there was such a gap between that and something else, but I do not agree that there is no way of setting limits on what it should be used for. That's nonsense to say it can't be. (*Applause.*)

Senator Taylor: Miss Thompson said that we must not use it for political purposes—this relief. I want to say that all relief we've

sent over there practically since UNRRA died, has been used for political purposes and it appears that all the rest of it is destined for the same use. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Gaeth: I'd like to say a word in behalf of the thousands of people who worked for UNRRA in Europe. I was in Europe as a correspondent for more than a year. I didn't spend much of my time in big cities, but I got out into the communities where the people got the relief, and I want to say that these people were thankful time and time again, and they were appreciative and enthusiastic of the kind of work which was done by UNRRA. (*Applause.*)

When a few governments like the Chinese and others got away with dirt, there were, however, many governments which did a fairly decent job and the UNRRA workers were serious and sincere. (*Applause.*)

Man: Thank you, Mr. Denny. Mr. Gaeth, how can we make the Marshall Plan less imperialistic so that the Comintern will have no basis on which to attack U. S. dollar imperialism?

Mr. Gaeth: We can make the Marshall Plan less imperialistic by moving that plan over into the United Nations and taking it away from the control of one country and then getting back on an international basis again. We might have to make some of the con-

tributions or most of the contributions as far as the monetary means are concerned. But unless we get our social institutions and other connected with the United Nations operating, we'll continue to work on the basis of power politics and not on the basis of international control. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: But there's a point there, Mr. Gaeth. Considering the speed or lack of speed at which the United Nations has operated so far, and considering the fact that experienced observers are now telling us that the French and Italians, in particular with regard to coal and grain, are going to reach the limit of endurance about the fifteenth of December, how do you propose that this need should be met? Through the UN machinery? It will be met about the fifteenth of next December.

Mr. Gaeth: Well, I've watched Congress work, too. I would suggest for the United States to make stop-gap contributions and then I'm sure that if the General Assembly and the United Nations machinery were given the problem to work with now, when it's in session, it would find a solution to that problem just about as quickly as Congress does. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: What problem has it found a solution for so far?

Senator Taylor: May I answer that?

Mr. Denny: Senator Taylor.

Senator Taylor: The United Na-

tions found a solution to the Iran problem when the Russians were in there, by consent as part of the war strategy. They overstayed their welcome. The matter was turned over to the United Nations. They didn't even have to invite the Russians to go home. The fact that it was turned over to the United Nations was sufficient. The Russians went home because they didn't want to stand condemned before the bar of world public opinion.

The British and French had overstayed their welcome — their period of tenure in Syria and Lebanon. The matter was called to the attention of the United Nations and the British and French fell over each other to see who could get out first, because they didn't want to be condemned before the world.

But when the question of Greece came up and it involved us, we hit the United Nations in the face with a dirty dish rag and said "Step aside, small fry, we'll handle this," and that was the most severe blow the United Nations has been struck. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: Of course, the questions the Senator brings forward are Security Council questions which are questions of quite a different sort. Mr. Gaeth is talking about the General Assembly and the machinery which it could use to carry on the economic rehabilitation of Europe. As far as

the matter of Lebanon is concerned, the British and French withdrew all right, but the Russians, who brought the question before the Security Council, vetoed the decision of the Security Council because they didn't like the way it was worded. The British and French got out anyway.

Mr. Denny: Yes. All right, Mr. Gaeth.

Mr. Gaeth: This doesn't involve a question of military security. It involves a question of relief and reconstruction, and that would be passed into other channels.

Mr. Denny: I want to ask a question here—an enlightenment for the benefit of our listeners—of either Senator Taylor or Miss Thompson, or both. We are speculating, Miss Thompson and Senator, on what the Marshall Plan is going to be without knowing yet what it's going to be and you and the Senator seem to differ on what it may be.

Now isn't it important for us to know whether the Marshall Plan is going to operate on the basis of a gift, or a loan, and what proportion of it will be a gift and what proportion will be a loan? It it's a gift, it might be given on one condition or no conditions. If it's a loan, it might be made on one condition or no conditions. Will you speak to that, Senator?

Senator Taylor: I don't know whether it's going to be a loan or a gift. I haven't inside sources

of information, as I said before, but I do know this—that I'm opposed to its being a loan. When the British loan was being discussed, I made a speech to the United States Senate and urged that we not loan them the money, because when you loan somebody money that they cannot pay back, you make an enemy. But nevertheless, we loaned them the money and today you can pick up a paper almost any day and see where this Englishman or that Britain has called us Uncle Shylock, the imperialist across the ocean, and it isn't only the Laborites but it's Mr. Churchill's crowd that are calling us those names because we loaned them money that they can't pay back. So if we're going to do anything, let's give it to them and forget it, because we'll never get it back anyhow. (*Applause.*)

Miss Thompson: I don't like this kind of indiscriminating yes or no about giving and lending. If you are giving people food or if you are in a war, for instance, helping people in a common cause by weapons which are then going to be exploded in the air and destroyed or if people are starving and you give them food, or you give them any other immediate consumer's goods like shoes or coats or sweaters, then the expectation of that being returned is very, very small because the food is going to be eaten and the clothes are going to be worn out.

But if you are handing out money to a country to build factories, to create productive wealth to create more productive wealth there is not the slightest reason in the world why, eventually, those loans should not be paid back.

I'm against those with very high interests. I'm against usury, in general, and I'm certainly for very long time opportunities for amortization.

But I don't think you make yourself popular in the world acting as though you were an idiot. I think we should make a differentiation between goods given for relief and goods given for the reconstruction of capital goods to create more capital. I don't see why they should not have a loan. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Gaeth: Well, there's another very important development that must be taken into consideration in connection with that. That is, if we give it to them as a loan, how are they going to pay it back unless we reconstitute completely our tariff policy and the manner in which we do business with the rest of the world? (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: Yes, I just wondered what we are doing at Geneva endeavoring to negotiate a large number of agreements and treaties and arrangements which we would break down, as far as possible, or reduce the barriers to trade. That's been the policy of the United States

several years. It was begun by Mr. Hull and has been carried on by all of his successors. In Geneva, we've been endeavoring against considerable resistance from other parts of the world to negotiate agreements that would reduce these tariff barriers.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Well, we seem to be getting deeper and deeper into the subject. Now our speakers will present their summaries of tonight's discussion.

We'll hear first the summary of Miss Dorothy Thompson.

Miss Thompson: In summarizing what Senator Taylor has said and Mr. Gaeth especially, I can't find out what they're *for*. I find that I know what they are against. They are against our foreign policy. They are against Mr. Stimson, who isn't making the foreign policy. They're against Governor Earle, who is a nice person to be against in my opinion. They're against—they're full of suspicions. Practically everything we do is being motivated by Wall Street. I wish they would name names and so on. We are in general an imperialist power, pushing out in all directions. We don't seem to have gotten very far, as far as I can see.

On the other hand, everybody else is afraid of us. We are upsetting everything in the world and everybody else is very nice. It is only we, who are behaving very badly.

Now I just don't happen to

agree with that. I've been around some and I think, as nations go, as states go, we are still more popular than most other people—maybe because we are rich but I think because, on the whole, we are kinder. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Miss Thompson. Now let's have a final word from Mr. Taylor himself. Senator Taylor. (*Applause.*)

Senator Taylor: Miss Thompson has asked that I be more specific on the kind of foreign policy I'd like for us to have. I have said that I want a foreign policy based on the Golden Rule—"do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

For example, how would we like it if the Russians came into Mexico and started dredging the harbors and building roads up to the United States border? We wouldn't like it. That's what we're doing in Turkey.

How would we like it if the Russians came into Mexico and gobbled up all the oil and we went down there and got a concession. Then the Russians said to the Mexicans, you don't have to ratify that concession unless you want to and we'll back you to the hilt. That's what we did in Iran.

I don't think we should do those things and I think the Russians have a right to get out through the Dardanelles. I believe, as the greatest power on earth, we should take the initiative and see that the

Dardanelles are internationalized under the United Nations. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, very much, Senator Taylor, Miss Dorothy Thompson, Arthur Gaeth and Major George Fielding Eliot for your frank and forthright counsel on this question.

Remember if you, our listeners, want a copy of tonight's discussion, you may receive it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

We continue with a great series of programs lined up for the month of December and next week on the eve of the special session of Congress we'll have a discussion of the subject "What Should We Do To Check Rising Prices?"

Our speakers will be Harold E. Stassen, first avowed candidate for the 1948 Republican presidential nomination and author of the forthcoming book, *Where I Stand*, to be published next Tuesday; and Leon Henderson, former OPA

Administrator, Chairman of the National Executive Committee of Americans for Democratic Action.

Our interrogators will be Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocers Manufacturers of America, and Robert R. Nathan, economist and author of *Mobilizing for Abundance*.

Our next two programs will originate jointly in New York City and Europe in anticipation of the Conference of Foreign Ministers which meets in London on November 25. On November 18, with two speakers and an audience at Berlin, presided over by our educational director, Dr. Gregg Ziemer, and two speakers and an audience in New York, we'll discuss the question "What Future for Germany?"

The following week with two speakers and an audience in London and two speakers and an audience here—our subject will be "What Future for Europe?" Please now to be with us next Tuesday at the sound of the Crier's Bell (*Applause.*)